

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☒ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,193	12/29/2000	Min Zhu	M-8860 US	2912

7590

09/28/2004

PHILIP W. WOO  
C/O SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP  
555 CALIFORNIA STREET  
SUITE 5000  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104-1715

EXAMINER

VU, KIEU D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/753,193

Applicant(s)

ZHU ET AL.

Examiner

Kieu D Vu

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-14 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-14, 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the RCE filed 08/05/04. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salesky et al ("Salesky", USP 6343313) and Kamada (USP 6381637).

Regarding claims 1, 7, and 13, Salesky teaches a computer system for distributed collaborative computing, the system comprising a plurality of server computers connected to a plurality of client computers via a global-area computer network (col 25, lines 23-36); a high-speed direct connection link connecting the plurality of server computers (col 3, lines 16-22) conducting an on-line conference among an arbitrary number of the client computers connected to an arbitrary number of the server computers over the global-area network and the high-speed direct connection link (Fig. 9A) and transmitting a document stored on one of the client computers on an arbitrary number of other client computers (col 7, lines 21-34). Salesky differs from the claims in that Salesky does not teach the assigning a respective unique identifier to each page of a document stored on one of the client computers for viewing on an arbitrary number of other client computers. However, this feature is known in the art as taught by Kamada. Kamada teaches a system having Internet automatic Web browsing function which comprises the assigning a respective unique identifier (URL address) to a page (col 1, lines 44-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Salesky and Kamada before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system taught by Salesky to include the assigning a respective unique identifier to a page taught by Kamada with the motivation being to enable the system to quickly and easily identify the page.

Regarding claims 2, 8, and 14, Salesky teaches the spawning one or more processes on the server computers controlling the viewing of the document (col 7, lines 35-55; col 29, lines 59-66) and monitoring the operational status of the spawned processes and spawning a new process in the event failure of a spawned process is detected (col 33, lines 16-17).

Regarding claim 3, Salesky teaches sharing an application program executed on one of the client computers on an arbitrary number of other client computers (col 7, lines 21-34).

Regarding claims 4, 10, and 16, Salesky teaches the detecting a failure of one of the server computers handling the on-line conference; disconnecting the failed server computer from the on-line conference; connecting another of the server computers to the conference; and resuming the on-line conference (line 66 of col 26 to line 24 of col 27).

Regarding claims 5, 11, and 17, Salesky teaches the storing information about the status of the on-line conference in the database (col 30, lines 15-24).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject ~~matter~~ <sup>matter</sup> pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salesky, Kamada, and Larson et al ("Larson", USP 5907324).

Regarding claims 6, 12, and 18, Salesky and Kamada do not teach the ensuring that a maximum number of authorized conference participants is not exceeded.

However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Larson. Larson teaches a desktop conferencing system which comprises the ensuring that a maximum number of authorized conference participants is not exceeded (line 65 of col 1 to line 3 of col 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Salesky, Kamada, and Larson before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the conferencing system taught by Salesky and Kamada to include the ensuring that a maximum number of authorized conference participants is not exceeded taught by Larson with the motivation being to control the number of authorized conference participants.

6. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salesky, Kamada, and May et al ("May", USP 6574674).

Regarding claims 19-20, Salesky and Kamada do not teach the determining whether a user has elected to jump to a new page in the document and transmitting the respective unique identifier for the new page to other client computer. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by May. Larson teaches a system for managing data while sharing application program which comprises the synchronization so that users can view the same page when sharing the shared data pool (col 9, lines 49-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Salesky, Kamada, and May before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the conferencing system taught by Salesky and Kamada to include the synchronization

taught by May with the motivation being to enable users to synchronously view pages in document.

7. Applicant's arguments filed 08/05/04 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that "The Salesky et al. and Kamanda references cannot be combined..." it is noted that such is not quite the case.

Salesky teaches a computer conferencing system in which a document can be transferred between users via networked environment. Salesky teaches that "during a conferencing session", "snap-shots" (page) (col 7, lines 35-40) are sent to all attendee client computers (line 66 of col 7 to line 1 of col 8). In the same field of accessing document in interconnected computer network that includes electronic conference (col 1, lines 10-19), Kamanda teaches assigning a respective unique identifier (URL address) to a page (col 1, lines 44-46). Therefore, Salesky and Kamanda are in the same field of endeavor and analogous to combine in the manner proposed in the rejection of claims 1, 7, and 13 above.

Applicant argues that "a web page is set up in advance" while "the image of a screen shot is ever changing", therefore, "screen shots" are "in contrast to" "web pages." However, it is noted that claims 1, 7, and 13 claim "page of a document" and according to Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (Tenth Edition), "document" is "a writing conveying information", therefore, screen shots of Salesky are indeed pages of a document and web pages of Kamada are pages of a document. Therefore, Applicant's argument is not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2173

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kieu D. Vu.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 703-605-1232 through the month of October, 2004 and at 571-272-4057 thereafter.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached at 703-308-3116 through the month of October, 2004 and at 571-272-4048 thereafter.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703-872-9306


and / or:

703-746-5639 through the month of October, 2004 and 571-273-4057 thereafter (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

Kieu D. Vu

09/17/04



JOHN CABECA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100